



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
PO Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/470,234	12/22/1999	DAVID L. SALGADO	D/99173	5920

7590 09/15/2003

JOHN E BECK  
XEROX CORPPRATION  
XEROX SQUARE-20A  
ROCHESTER, NY 14644

EXAMINER

POON, KING Y

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2624	2

DATE MAILED: 09/15/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/470,234	SALGADO ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	King Y. Poon	2624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1 and 4-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 2 and 3 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 22 December 1999 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.  
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
 \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
 a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____. 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.
--	---

Art Unit: 2624

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Drawings***

1. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference character, for example, "24" of fig. 1 and fig. 6 has been used to designate both motor and printer. Other reference characters such as 22, 32, of fig. 1 and fig. 6 is having the same problem. Correction is required.
2. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: for example, roller 18, substrate 14 of page 5, transfer assist apparatus 50 of page 6, specification, is not shown in fig. 6. Correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1, 4-9, 11-13, 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Recht et al. (US 5,841,851)

Art Unit: 2624

Regarding claim 1: Recht teaches an apparatus (fig. 1) for connecting a transmission line (cord, column 2, line 33) that terminates with a connector (plug, column 2, line 33) to a device (telephone, column 2, lines 44), comprising: (a) a receptacle (fig. 4) for receiving the connector; and (b) a sensor (condition detector, column 7, lines 60-67) associated with the receptacle for detecting the presence of the connector within the receptacle (line connected, 808, 812, fig. 8, column 7, lines 50-67, column 8, lines 8-28, note).

Note: Column 2, lines 5-24, teaches the lines are connected by the presence of the connector within the receptacle. (Inserting the plug into the jack)

Regarding claim 4: Recht teaches the apparatus further comprising a signal detector (microprocessor, column 5, lines 45-60, ring detector, column 6, lines 37, speaker 222, column 5, lines 50-56, forms a signal detector) for detecting signals (e.g., signals, column 5, lines 45-55, column 6, lines 37-45) communicated through the transmission line.

Regarding claim 5: Recht teaches wherein the signal detector is for detecting a telephone dial tone. (Column 1, lines 29-32)

Regarding claim 6: Recht teaches wherein, in response to a signal from the sensor indicating that the connector is present within the receptacle, (above 0 volts, column 8, lines 10-27, to set up two line operating mode, column 8, lines 48-52, fig. 9) a determination is made, with the signal detector, whether signals (ringing signals) are being communicated through the transmission line. (1202, fig. 12, column 3, lines 32-38)

Art Unit: 2624

Regarding claim 7: Recht teaches wherein, in response to a failure by the signal detector to detect signals through the transmission line, (line disconnected, 802, 804, fig. 8) a determination is made, with the sensor, whether the connector is present within the receptacle. (808, 812, fig. 8)

Regarding claim 8: Recht teaches wherein the sensor is utilized to determine whether the connector is present within the receptacle when the device is activated. (Power up, fig. 8)

Regarding claim 9: Recht teaches wherein the signal detector is utilized to detect signals through the transmission line at times other than on device activation. (1102, fig. 11, column 7, lines 60-67)

Regarding claim 11: Retch teaches a method of communicating through a transmission line (cord, column 2, line 33) that terminates with a connector, (plug, column 2, line 33) adapted to be received in a receptacle, (fig. 4) comprising: (a) determining whether the connector is present within the receptacle; (line connected, 808, 802, fig. 8, column 7, lines 50-67, column 8, lines 8-28, note) and (b) determining whether a signal (e.g., signals, column 5, lines 45-55, column 6, lines 37-45) is being communicated through the transmission line.

Note: Column 2, lines 5-24, teaches the lines are connected by the presence of the connector within the receptacle. (Inserting the plug into the jack)

Regarding claim 12: Retch teaches wherein the step of determining whether the connector is present within the receptacle (fig. 9) occurs before the step of determining whether a signal is

Art Unit: 2624

being communicated through the transmission line. (1202, fig. 12, column 8, lines 28-47, column 3, lines 35-40)

Regarding claim 13: Retch teaches the step of initiating activation of a device (power up, fig. 8) prior to the step of determining whether the connection is present within the receptacle.

Regarding claim 16: Retch teaches wherein the step of determining whether a signal is being communicated through the transmission line (voltage, column 8, lines 8-28) occurs before determining whether the connector is present within the receptacle. (The detected voltage is used to determine whether the connector is presented within the receptacle; i.e., voltage is detected before detecting connection)

Regarding claim 17: Retch teaches wherein, in response to determining that a signal is not being communicated through the transmission line, (detecting 0 volts, column 8, lines 21-28) determining whether the connector is present within the receptacle. (The processor 212 determines “connected” or “disconnected,” column 7, lines 50-65)

Regarding claim 18: Retch teaches the step of initiating the step of determining whether a signal is being communicated through the transmission line (1202, fig. 12) at times other than activation of a device.

Regarding claim 19: Retch teaches in response to determining that the connector is present within the receptacle, (808, 1st line is connected, fig. 8) delaying processing of the operation currently being performed by the device (e.g., 1st line is in used currently, 1206, fig. 12,

Art Unit: 2624

and 2nd line is in ringing, 1204, fig. 12, a user would select 2nd line for use, 1228, fig. 12, and delaying the used of the 1st line) when the current operation requires use of the transmission line.

Regarding claim 20: Retch teaches in response to determining that the plug connector is not present within the receptacle, (no to 900 and 904, fig. 9) aborting (disable, column 8, line 53) processing of the operation (the operation of allowing a user to use line interface to use phone line, column 8, lines 50-56) currently being performed by the device when such operation requires use of the transmission line.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Retch et al (US 5,841,851).

Regarding claim 14: Retch does not teach teaches in response to determining that the connector is not present within the receptacle, requiring the operator to intervene in order for further operations to occur.

Art Unit: 2624

However, column 2, lines 5-23, teaches to insert the connector/plug into the phone jack/receptacle, for connection; i.e., in order for the connector to be present within the receptacle such that a user would use the phone, the user must insert the connector into the receptacle, when the connector is not present within the receptacle.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Retch to include: in response to determining that the connector is not present within the receptacle, requiring the operator to insert the connector into the receptacle (intervene in order for further operations to occur).

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Retch because it would have allowed the system to work and a user would be able to use the system to make a phone call.

Regarding claim 15: Retch does not teach in response to determining that a signal is not being communicated through the transmission line, placing a device in a condition that is ready to perform further operations.

However, column 2, lines 5-23, teaches to insert the connector/plug into the phone jack/receptacle, for connection; i.e., in order for the connector to be present within the receptacle such that a user would use the phone, the user must insert the connector into the receptacle, when the connector is not present within the receptacle.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Retch to include: in response to determining that the

Art Unit: 2624

connector is not present within the receptacle, requiring the operator to insert the connector into the receptacle (placing the device in a condition that is ready to perform further operations).

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Retch because it would have allowed the system to work and a user would be able to use the system to make a phone call.

7. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horne (US 6,298,122) in view of Recht et al (US 5,841,851).

Regarding claim 10: Horne teaches a printing machine (fax machine column 2, 31) capable of communicating through a transmission line (telephone wire, column 2, line 34) that terminates with a connector, (RJ -11 plug, column 4, lines 64-65) comprising: (a) a receptacle for receiving the connector. (female RJ-11 connector, column 4, lines 56).

Horne does not teach a sensor associated with the receptacle for detecting the presence of the connector within the receptacle; and a sensor circuit, communicating with the detecting sensor, for transmitting a signal indicating whether the detecting sensor detects the presence of the connector.

Recht, in the same field of communicating signals using telephone wires (tip and ring, fig. 1, Horne; column 5, lines 30-35), teaches a sensor (condition detector, column 7, lines 60-63) associated with a receptacle (phone jack, column 7, lines 14-20) for detecting the presence of the connector within the receptacle; (808, 812, fig. 8, column 2, lines 5-25) and a sensor circuit,

Art Unit: 2624

(microprocessor, column 7, line 62) communicating with the detecting sensor, (column 7, lines 60-65) for transmitting a signal (a signal to enable or disable a user interface, column 8, lines 55-67) indicating whether the detecting sensor detects the presence of the connector. (Column 2, lines 5-25, connected, is when the plug is being inserted into the receptacle)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Horne' printing machine to include: a sensor associated with the receptacle for detecting the presence of the connector within the receptacle; and a sensor circuit, communicating with the detecting sensor, for transmitting a signal indicating whether the detecting sensor detects the presence of the connector.

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Horne' printing machine by the teaching of Recht because of the following reasons: (a) it would have allowed the printing machine to inform users that the phone line is not connected to minimized confusion to the users, as taught by Retch at column 8, lines 47-65, column 9, lines 35-45; and (b) it would have allowed the users to realize that the phone line is not connected so that the user would connect the phone line for fax machine to be properly functioning.

Art Unit: 2624

*Allowable Subject Matter*

8. Claims 2, 3 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

9. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Claim 2 is allowable over the prior art of record since the cited references taken individually or in combination fails to particularly disclose an apparatus for connecting a transmission line that terminates with a connector to a device comprising a sensor associated with the receptacle for detecting the presence of the connector within the receptacle, “wherein the sensor comprises a pressure switch within the receptacle.” It is noted that the closest prior art, Recht et al, (US 5,841,851) shows a similar apparatus for connecting a transmission line comprising a sensor for detecting the presence of the connector within the receptacle. However Recht et al fails to disclose: “wherein the sensor comprises a pressure switch within the receptacle.” as claimed.

Claim 3 is allowable over the prior art of record since the cited references taken individually or in combination fails to particularly disclose an apparatus for connecting a transmission line that terminates with a connector to a device comprising a sensor associated with the receptacle for detecting the presence of the connector within the receptacle, “wherein the sensor comprises an optical sensor within the receptacle.” It is noted that the closest prior art,

Art Unit: 2624

Recht et al, (US 5,841,851) shows a similar apparatus for connecting a transmission line comprising a sensor for detecting the presence of the connector within the receptacle. However Recht et al fails to disclose: “wherein the sensor comprises an optical sensor within the receptacle.” as claimed.

*Conclusion*

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to King Y. Poon whose telephone number is (703) 305-0892 or to Supervisor Mr. David Moore whose phone number is (703) 308-7452.

September 11, 2003

*King Yau Poon*